REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 7, 22 and 24 are objected to because the rejection alleges that "changing a channel implies two different channels, and thus if the transport streams are the same, the channel is not being changed." Applicants respectfully disagree in view of the following.

The instant application discloses that there are commonly a plurality of different programs contained within a single digital transport stream (see Instant Application, page 15, lines 3-5). The instant application further discloses that transport streams can be carried in different RF frequencies or multiplexed in the same frequency or they can be multiplexed together in a single cable pathway (see Instant Application, page 15, lines 9-11). Accordingly, two different channels that have different programs may be within the same transport stream while enabling a user to change the channel. As such, withdrawal of the objection is earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 7, 23, 24 and 26 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as allegedly being anticipated by Wrife US 6,950,151 (hereinafter Wrife). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection in view of the following.

Independent Claim 1 recites a first tuner to access a first transport stream associated with a first frequency and a second tuner that during spare periods accesses a second transport stream associated with a second frequency, as claimed. Accordingly, two tuners are recited. The first tuner accesses a first transport stream having a first frequency and the second tuner accesses a second transport stream having a second frequency during spare periods.

In contrast, Wrife discloses an incoming television communication link that transfers all the channels that can be displayed (see Wrife, col. 2, lines 33-34). The incoming digital content is decompressed in the channel selector and forwarded for display on the screen (see Wrife, col. 2, lines 53-55).

Accordingly, Wrife discloses that one television communication link carries all the channels. One communication link that carries all the channels, as disclosed by Wrife, differs from a first transport stream associated with a first frequency and a second transport stream associated with a second frequency, as claimed. As such, Wrife fails to teach or suggest a first transport stream associated with a first frequency and a second transport stream associated with a second frequency, as claimed.

Moreover, Wrife discloses one channel selector decompresses the digital content to be displayed, as presented and discussed above. One channel

selector, as disclosed by Wrife, differs from a first tuner and a second tuner, as claimed. Furthermore, a mere disclosure of one channel selector, as disclosed by Wrife, fails to either teach or suggest using a second tuner during spare periods accesses a second transport stream, as claimed.

Accordingly, independent Claim 1 is patentable over Wrife, under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Dependent Claim 7 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency. As such, allowance of Claims 1 and 7 is earnestly solicited.

As per Claim 7, the rejection asserts that the claim is interpreted as reading "wherein the first transport stream and said second transport stream are different and wherein said frequency and said second frequency are different." Applicants respectfully submit that this interpretation is not consistent with the detailed description of the instant application, as presented and discussed with respect to the claim objections. As such, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of Claim 7 is earnestly solicited.

As per independent Claim 23, Wrife fails to teach or suggest a first decoder and a second decoder, as claimed under similar rationale as independent Claim 1. In fact, Wrife teaches away by disclosing that the channel selector decompresses the incoming digital signal and forwards the result to the screen for display (see Wrife, col. 2, lines 53-55). As a result, Wrife discloses

only one channel selector that decompresses the appropriate channel in response to a remote control.

Accordingly, Wrife fails to anticipate independent Claim 23, under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Dependent claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency.

Claim 26 recites a limitation similar to that of independent Claim 1, as presented and discussed above. Therefore, Wrife fails to teach or suggest using a second tuner to access a second transport stream, as claimed under similar rationale, as presented above.

As such, allowance of Claims 23, 24 and 26 is earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2-6, 8-22, 25 and 27-29 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Wrife in view of Reitmeier U.S. Patent No. 6,115,080 (hereinafter Reitmeier). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection in view of the following.

As per Claims 2-6, 8, 25 and 27-29, Reitmeier fails to teach or suggest the shortcomings of Wrife with respect to independent Claims 1 and 23. Thus, the

combination of Wrife and Reitmeier fails to render Claims 2-6, 8, 25 and 27-29 obvious, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), by virtue of their dependency.

As per Claims 5 and 12, Reitmeier discloses that each time an I-frame is identified, the I-frame is stored in a location in memory associated with a particular program stream (see Reitmeier, col. 5, lines 50-53). Reitmeier further discloses that this process is repeated until the controller causes the auxiliary demux and processing unit to demultiplex a new video elementary stream from within (see Reitmeier, col. 5, lines 55-57). Identifying an I-frame and storing it, as disclosed by Reitmeier, fails to either teach or suggest that the digital content comprises decoded I-frames of the new channel, as claimed.

As per Claims 6 and 14, Wrife discloses that when the incoming digital signal is encoded, the stored sequence must contain at least one I-frame (see Wrife, col. 2, lines 45-51). The incoming digital signal is then decompressed in the channel selector (see Wrife, col. 2, lines 53-55 and Figure 1, elements 10 and 12). Thus, the encoded information is stored in the memory unit and it is decompressed after it is sent to the channel selector. Accordingly, Wrife fails to teach or suggest caching the digital content decoded from the plurality of transport streams, as claimed since encoded information is stored in the memory unit of Wrife.

As per Claims 8, 15 and 16, the rejection without evidentiary support asserts that the limitation is shown in Reitmeier. Applicants respectfully disagree. Reitmeier discloses circuitry to implement a PIP processor (see Reitmeier, col. 4, lines 35-37). However, implementation of a PIP processor, as disclosed by Reitmeier, fails to teach or suggest that the digital content cached is associated with a channel that is predicted next channel which is predicted based on a previous channel selections, as claimed.

Wrife fails to teach or suggest the limitations of independent Claim 9, under similar rationale that Wrife fails to teach or suggest the limitations of independent Claim 1. For example, Wrife fails to teach or suggest a first transport stream associated with a first frequency and a second transport stream associated with a second frequency, as claimed. Moreover, Wrife fails to teach or suggest a first tuner and a second tuner, as claimed.

The rejection admits that Wrife fails to teach a third tuner, as claimed. The rejection relies on Reitmeier. Reitmeier fails to remedy the shortcomings of Wrife with respect to the limitations of independent Claim 9 that are similar to that of independent Claim 1, as discussed above. Moreover, Reitmeier fails to teach or suggest a third tuner, as claimed in view of the following.

Reitmeier discloses that in the case of multiple tuner/demodulator system, an additional tuner/demodulator pair is used to scan other physical channels (see Reitmeier, col. 15, lines 31-34). Reitmeier discloses two tuners and two demodulators (see Reitmeier, Figure 1, elements 10A, 10B, 15A and 15B). As such, Reitmeier fails to teach or suggest a third tuner to access a third transport stream associated with a third frequency, as claimed.

Accordingly, Wrife alone or in combination with Reitmeier fails to render independent Claim 9 obvious, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Dependent claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency.

As per Claim 11, Wrife does not teach or suggest switching such that the first tuner that was previously displaying a program associated with the first transport stream now accesses a fourth transport stream associated with a fourth frequency, as claimed. This is so because a third tuner is now used to access the third transport stream and the main picture area displays the new channel associated with the third transport stream, as claimed.

Claims 17-22, 25 and 27-29 recite some and/or combination of limitations similar to those already presented and discussed above. Accordingly, Claims 17-22, 25 and 27-29 are patentable under similar rationale as presented above.

Accordingly, Wrife alone or in combination with Reitmeier fails to render Claims 2-6, 8-22, 25 and 27-29 obvious, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). As such, allowance of Claims 2-6, 8-22, 25 and 27-29 is earnestly solicited.

For the above reasons, the Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-29 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, allowance of the rejected Claims 1-29 is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Dated: April 10th, 2008

Respectfully submitted,
MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Amir A. Tabarrok
Registration No. 57,137

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113

(408) 938-9060 Voice
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile